

REMARKS

Applicants submit this Amendment in response to the Office Action dated October 5, 2010. Reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were pending in this case; claims 1 and 10 were the only independent claims, but claim 10 has been canceled herewith, so at present claim 1 is the only independent claim. In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected on the basis of prior art, and claims 1 and 2 were rejected for indefiniteness; the Examiner indicated, however, that claim 2 contains allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten so as not to depend from a rejected claim, and so as to overcome the indefiniteness rejections. The Examiner also raised objections to claims 3-9 as well as an objection to the text of the specification.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowability as to dependent claim 2, but applicants believe that independent claim 1 is allowable as well, and will explain the basis for this belief hereinbelow.

Turning first to the objections to claims 3-9 raised in paragraph 1 of the Office Action, applicants have overcome these informalities by amending the claim dependencies hereinabove so that claims 3-9 are no longer in improper multiple dependent form, and it is requested that these claims now be treated on the merits. Applicants have also overcome the Examiner's objection to the specification by introducing and/or substituting the preferred section headings at the appropriate places, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

Turning next to the statutory claim rejections based upon indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as enumerated in paragraphs 2-8 of the Office Action (most of which refer to lack of antecedent basis), applicants contend that each of these objections and rejections either has now been overcome by virtue of the amendments made hereinabove, or has been rendered moot by virtue of the cancellation of claim 10. Support for the wording added in claim 2, following the respective phrases "plane π " and "plane $\pi 1$," may be found in Table 1 of the specification, and applicants contend that the rototranslational equations to which reference is made in claim 2 (as amended) are well known in the art.

Turning finally to the patentability of the claims in light of the prior art, in paragraphs 9-13 of the Office Action claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for

lack of novelty, based separately upon two different prior art references, but in view of the cancellation of claim 10 hereinabove, those rejections have been rendered moot. Nevertheless, claim 1 was rejected in paragraphs 14-19 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as "obvious" over Langer. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, however, and contend that claims 1 and 3-9 are patentable over Langer, for the reasons set forth below.

The presently claimed invention provides a system capable of acquiring data relating to the shape and the surface colour of the object to be reproduced. The information is acquired as a series of cartesian coordinates with associated colour data, and is made available in a data format that can be used by a printer capable of reproducing in shape and colour a series of profiles of the surface of the object. The implementation in the form of a linear light beam whose striking line on the object's surface is read by a photo camera or similar device provides an adequate and structurally simple way to achieve this goal.

Langer provides a method for reproducing a three-dimensional object by means of stereolithography. The method preferred by Langer to acquire the shape of the object to be reproduced is based on the Moire effect. As it is apparent from the Examiner's summary of Langer, this choice is strictly correlated with the use of

extension fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit
Account No. 07-1730.

Applicants have responded herein to all of the points raised by the Examiner in
the Office Action, and applicants have amended the claims in an earnest effort to place
this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, further favorable action in
connection with this patent application is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to
contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it will advance the prosecution of this
case.

Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN
Attorneys for Applicants
270 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016-0601
(212) 684-3900

By: 

David S. Kashman
(Registration No. 28,725)

Dated: New York, New York
February 22, 2011